

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the performance of a thorough search. By this amendment, the paragraphs between lines 15-23 of page 2 and between lines 1-13 of page 3 in the specification have been amended. Claims 1 and 36 have been amended. No claims have been added or cancelled, and no new matter has been introduced. Hence, claims 1-70 are pending in the application.

OBJECTIONS

The Office Action objects to pages 2 and 3 of the specification, because some of the patent applications listed on the pages do not include the US Patent Application Serial Numbers (Office Action, pages 2-3). Amendments to the specification have been made to overcome the objections.

SUMMARY OF THE REJECTIONS

Claims 1-15, 17-27, 30-35, 36-50, 52-62, and 65-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Papierniak et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,151,601 ("Papierniak"). Claims 16, 28-29, 51, and 63-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papierniak in view of Moore et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,330,575 B1 ("Moore").

I. Claims 1-15, 17-27, 30-35, 36-50, 52-62, and 65-70

Claims 1-15, 17-27, 30-35, 36-50, 52-62, and 65-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Papierniak. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

I.1. Claims 1 and 36

Applicants respectfully submit that Papierniak does not anticipate the original independent claims 1 and 36, because (among other things) Papierniak does not disclose the claimed "a plurality of second parties subscribing to database services..." The section that the Office Action cited for this claim limitation (Office Action, page 3, item 3) is as follows:

"Internet Service Centers 10 may also provide Web Hosting Service and Electronic Commerce Applications. One implementation of Internet Service Centers for ISPs/CSPs is a single site with multiple servers 18 (Web Server Cluster) interconnected through a campus network 20. In addition, Internet Service Centers optionally provide Authentication Service, Domain Name Service, Mail Service, News Service, Provisioning Service, and Network Management Service." (Papierniak, col. 10, lines 30-38)

Nowhere in the cited section refers to, teaches, or suggests the claimed "subscribing to database services." Thus, for at least the reason set forth above, the original Claims 1 and 36 are patentable over Papierniak.

Although the original Claims 1 and 36 are clearly allowable in view of Papierniak, to further clarify any possible confusions, the claims have been amended to include additional limitations that are not disclosed, taught, and suggested by Papierniak. The added limitation clarifies that the claimed database services include "services for storing and managing data provided by the second parties." In other words, the data that the claimed database services manage or store are provided by the *subscribers* to the database services, and not by the party providing the database services.

I.2. Claims 2-15, 17-27, 30-35, 37-50, 52-62, and 65-70

Because claims 2-15, 17-27, 30-35, 37-50, 52-62, and 65-70 depend either directly or indirectly on claims 1 and 36, these claims are patentable over Papierniak for at least the same reasons set forth above.

II. Claims 16, 28-29, 51, and 63-64

Claims 16, 28-29, 51, and 63-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papierniak in view of Moore. The rejection is respectfully traversed, because the Office Action fails to factually support any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness.

Specifically, Papierniak and Moore, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest all the claim limitations of claims 16, 28-29, 51, and 63-64. As discussed above, Papierniak fails to disclose "subscribing to database services" in the original independent claims 1 and 36 and also fails to disclose "services for storing and managing data provided by the second parties" in the amended claims 1 and 36. Similarly, Moore does not disclose, teach, or suggest the aforementioned two claim limitations. Instead, Moore focuses on "methods and systems for designing a Web page, to be hosted on a Web page server." (Moore, Abstract). Because claims 16, 28-29, 51, and 63-64 either directly or indirectly depend on claims 1 and 36, they are patentable over Papierniak in view of Moore for at least the same reasons set forth above in Section I.1.



SUMMARY


Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims 1-70 are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP


Brian D. Hickman, Reg. No. 35,894

1600 Willow Street
San Jose, CA 95125
(408) 414-1080, Ext. 201
Date: February 11, 2004
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076

RECEIVED

FEB 19 2004

Technology Center 2100

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Non-Fee Amend, Commissioner for Patents, Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on 2/11/04 by Clare Fung